

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 25, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. Claims 11-15 are hereby newly added. Exemplary support for claim 11-15 can be clearly found throughout the Applicant's Specification.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shima (Pub. No. 2002/0036665, hereinafter "Shima"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection

Claim 1 recites in part:

a paper image creating section that creates a paper image in such a manner that an imposition for at least one page frame is applied onto a paper, and a page including an image and/or a character is disposed in the page frame on a layout in which an imaginary page frame including the page frame is set up, so that a whole of the paper, in which the page is disposed, is provided in form of an image;

The Examiner takes the position that in Fig. 1, Element 58, the user interface, serves as the paper image creating section. However, Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner fails to allege that the image creating section creates a paper image... so that a whole of the paper, in which the page is disposed, is provided in form of an image. Furthermore, Shima fails to teach this feature regarding the creation of an image. Shima conducts marginless printing by "converting drawing data, which is created by an application program and corresponds to a sheet of printing papers, whose size is larger than a specific size of a sheet of printing paper to be actually printed, to a printing command and for transmitting the printing command to a printer." See para. 8. Thus, when marginless printing mode designation is accepted by the marginless

printing mode designation, the drawing data is converted into a command. Shima, at best, only teaches the production of drawing data and its conversion, so that a region bigger than the actual paper is printed on, leading to marginless printing. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of an image creating section which provides an image as is done in the claimed invention. Additionally, Element 58 merely allows for acceptance of a marginless printing mode designation. It does not function to meet all the limitations of the paper image creating section of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, there is no outputting of an image on the paper by applying the paper image created in the paper image creating section. As illustrated in FIGs. 6 and 7, the drawing data is sent to be converted into printing commands based on data representing the dimensions of size in the paper feed direction of the necessary minimum printing region. *See col. 62.* Accordingly, the output is based on these print commands and not on an image produced by the image creating section.

Claim 1 further contains the limitation of “a processing interruption section that interrupts a series of processing of creating the paper image and outputting the created paper image to the paper...in the event that the page disposed on the layout juts out the imaginary page frame.” As discussed above, Shima fails to teach the creation of such a paper image. Furthermore, there is no teaching of such a processing interruption section. In Shima, there is no interruption based on any precondition, rather marginless printing designation is either accepted or not accepted. As can be seen in Figure 11, Shima merely operates to either set an expanded printing region (leading to marginless printing) or set ordinary printing region, if marginless printing mode designation is not accepted. As discussed above, this acceptance of marginless printing

designation is through a user interface 58, by the user, and not based on a precondition. *See* Fig. 5, col. 48.

Additionally, Shima could never meet the limitation that the page disposed on the layout juts out the imaginary page frame. The expanded region (which allegedly serves as the imaginary page frame under the Examiner's interpretation, *see* Office Action, pg. 3, rejection for claim 2) is the outer most frame in the Shima. Therefore, in Shima, the page disposed on the layout never juts out of the alleged imaginary page frame. Accordingly, no such process interruption section is disclosed.

Thus, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Shima and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

All the features of independent claim 3 are also not present in the cited reference. Claim 3 recites in part:

a paper image creating section that creates a paper image in such a manner that the page adjusted in size in the page size adjusting section is disposed in the page frame on the layout, so that a whole of the paper, in which the page is disposed, is provided in form of an image.

The claimed invention requires that a paper image including the page frame on the layout is provided in form of an image. As discussed above, Shima does not teach these features. Furthermore, Shima, on the other hand, does not want data within a page frame (as in the present invention), rather it wants to the ability to specify an expanded part overrunning the size of the printing paper. The overrunning part effects the amount that is cutoff for marginless printing. Due to the fact, that Shima does disclose all the features of claim 3, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 7-10 are allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Additionally, since claims 4-6 have been rejected by the Examiner on the basis of the same rationale as for claims 1-3 and they contain the limitations argued above, these claims should be held patentable over Shima as well.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 9, Fig. 9 merely illustrates a relationship between a sheet of printing papers and the expanded printing region. *See* para. 30. Accordingly, Shima merely teaches that a different size of an expanded printing region is chosen depending on the type of paper. Shima teaches use of drawing data either of the size of the paper or the expanded region. Claim 9 necessitates that a page is within the boundary of the imaginary page frame and outside the boundary of the page frame. Nothing, in Shima meets this requirement. As discussed above, the expanded printing region serves as the alleged imaginary page frame. *See* Office Action, pg. 3. Accordingly, drawing data according to the size of the paper actually being printed on or corresponding to the expanded print region is used. In Shima, there is no teaching of a page being disposed in between these two alleged boundaries. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 10 is allowable for analogous reasons as presented for claim 9 above.

**Newly Added Claims**

Newly added claims 11-15 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.  
Applicant further asserts that their subject matter is not disclosed by the cited art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 20, 2008

  
Susan Perng Pan  
Registration No. 41,239